



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cn  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,056	08/23/2001	Youlin J. Li	7103/205	1652
757	7590	12/18/2003	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60611			NGUYEN, GEORGE BINH MINH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	16
DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Candidate(s)</b>	
	09/938,056	LI ET AL	
	<b>Examiner</b> George Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 3723	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
**THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.                    6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt is acknowledged of Applicant's preliminary amendment filed on September 02, 2003.

Claims 1-14 were canceled. Claims 24-25 were added.

Claims 15-25 are presented for examination.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 02, 2003 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:


(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlov et al.'6,086,457 in view of Togawa et al.'6,413,154.

With reference to Figs. 19-25, col. 32, line 18, to col. 34, line 26, Perlov discloses the claimed invention including: a) a first CMP polisher 50a; b) second CMP polisher 50b; b)


Art Unit: 3723

a plurality of slurry suppliers 5236a-c which are interchangeably supplied to polishers 50a-c. However, Perlov is silent about which slurry suppliers is supplying oxidizing-free medium and which slurry supplier is supplying oxidizing medium.



With reference to Fig. 4, col. 3, line 49 to col. 4, line 3, Togawa teaches that stock solution may include an acidic, alkaline or neutral solution containing abrasive particles such as silica-gel, depending on the nature of the workpiece, and dilution liquid is normally deionized water containing no harmful impurities.

U.S. Patent  
Jul 11, 2000  
Sheet 24 of 24  
6,086,457

U.S. Patent  
Jul 2, 2002  
Serial No. 441154  
US 6441154 B1

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Perlov apparatus with the teaching of employing different stock solutions with oxidizing liquid or oxidizer-free liquid as taught by Togawa to suit the polishing apparatus for optimum performances, depending on the nature of the workpiece.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 21, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's arguments, 37 CFR Section 1.111(b) states, "A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section." Applicant has failed to specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Art Unit: 3723

2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-308-0163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday/630AM-300PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 703-308-2687. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3579 for regular communications and 703-305-3579 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1078.

*George Nguyen*  
Primary Examiner



George Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3723

GN  
December 17, 2003